REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10 and 15 are the independent claims. Claims 1-20 stand rejected.

The specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for "a surface normal vector." Applicants respectfully disagree. The phrase "surface normal vector" appears in the list of parameters for an example lighting equation on pages 4 and 5 of the specification, and is used as a parameter for such a lighting equation in claims 6, 12 and 16. Because the phrase "surface normal vector" appears in the same context in the specification as it does in the claims, the meaning of the phrase is clearly "ascertainable by reference to the description." 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objection.

In the Official Action, claims 1-20 were rejected as indefinite under 35 USC § 112.

Claims 1, 10 and 15 were objected to as failing to specify how many selected parameters correspond to how many texture maps. Claims 1, 10 and 15 have been amended by the applicants' representative to indicate that a selected parameter corresponds to a texture value. Applicants respectfully submit that this overcomes the objection

Claims 1, 10 and 15 were further objected to because "the parameters included in the claim that defines a pixel value is unclear since a value that selects a texture is a parameter that defines a pixel. Applicant needs to clarify in the claim the claimed parameter." Applicants respectfully disagree. On at least page 7 of the specification, texture values are said not to be parameters that define pixels: "...a set of parameters is selected to be associated with texture values." Texture values are not themselves parameters according to the specification's use of the term "parameters," but rather values that are derived from parameters. The term "parameters" here has been given a special meaning in the description in accordance with MPEP § 2111.01, and that special meaning should be used in lieu of the plain meaning. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objection.

Page 6 of 8

Claim 1 was further objected to because "the substituting step claims 'in place of a values produced from an algorithm' is unclear since the texture value is being substituted for a value that is used in the lighting equation rather than a result of the lighting equation." Applicants have amended the claim at lines 8-9 to clarify that the texture value is being substituted for a result of the lighting equation. Applicants respectfully submit that this overcomes the objection.

Claim 8 was objected to for failing to "identify the method when the claim claims 'the method of further.'" Applicants have amended the claim to indicate that "the method" is the method as recited in claim 7. Applicants respectfully submit that this overcomes the objection.

Claim 9 was objected to as "unclear since the lighting equation is not being used to determine the pixel value of parent claim 1." Claim 1, lines 13-14 recites that a pixel value is determined "by using the unselected parameters and the texture values over the primitive." The language of this claim allows for those unselected parameters and texture values to be used over the primitive as arguments to a lighting equation. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objection.

Claims 14 was objected to as "unclear since the lighting equation is not being used to determine the pixel value of parent claim 10." Claim 10, lines 15-16 recites that a pixel value is generated by a rendering unit "in response to the texture values of the selected parameters and to the unselected parameters." The language of this claim allows for said rendering unit to execute a lighting equation function. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objection.

Claim 15 was objected to because "this claim does not clearly claim a means. This substituting step claims 'in place of a values produced from an algorithm' is unclear since the texture value is being substituted for a value that is used in the lighting equation rather than a result of the lighting equation." Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify that the texture

value is being substituted for a result of the lighting equation. Applicants respectfully submit that this overcomes the objection.

Claim 18 was objected to as "unclear since the lighting equation is not being used to determine the pixel value of parent claim 15." Applicants respectfully disagree. Claim 15, lines 18-19, states that there are "means for determining the pixel value by using the unselected values and the texture values over the primitive..." A lighting equation may be such a means. Applicants respectfully submit that this overcomes the objection.

CONCLUSION

In the view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' representative.

Date: October 18, 2007

/Michael J. Swope/
Michael J. Swope
Registration No. 38,041

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439